

### REMARKS


The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, claims 1-3 and 9 have been cancelled, while claim 8 has been made a proper independent claim and includes the limitations of cancelled claim 1.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,583,245 to Gelow et al. The Examiner has further rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gelow et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,923,768 to Frindle et al. Applicants acknowledge that the Examiner has allowed claims 4-7 and 11, and has found claims 8 and 12 allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above changes, Applicants believe that the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a) have been overcome, and that claims 4-8, 11 and 12 should now be allowed.

Applicants believe that this application, containing claims 4-8, 11 and 12, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by   
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613  
Attorney  
Tel.: 914-333-9611

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

It is hereby certified that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. BOX 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

On September 2, 2004  
By Natalie J. Mango